DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 934 IR 056 209

AUTHOR Brewster, Suzanne H.
TITLE Personal Name Formation of Victorian Era Painters: A Comparison of Scholar-Created Bibliographic Tools and the Library of Congress Name Authority File.
PUB DATE May 96
NOTE 115p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Information; *Authority Control (Information); Bibliographic Databases; *Bibliographic Utilities; Comparative Analysis; Humanities; *Information Retrieval; Painting (Visual Arts); Relevance (Information Retrieval); *Research Tools; Search Strategies; User Needs (Information); User Satisfaction (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Anglo American Cataloging Rules; Library of Congress; MARC; *Name Authority Files; *Personal Names; Victorian Period

ABSTRACT

As information professionals attempt to meet the needs of scholars, a significant issue is the degree of correspondence between research tools created by library and information science professionals and research tools created and used by scholars in any particular academic discipline. Humanities scholars assign importance to the use of personal names. This study compares the formation of the names of Victorian Era painters found in selected bibliographic tools created by humanities scholars to the formation of names found in the Library of Congress authority file. A sample of 57 painters, divided into 12 problem categories derived from chapter 22 of "Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules," was searched in six bibliographic tools and in the name authority file. Comparisons were made of the variant forms found in the tools and in the 100 and 400 fields of the MARC authority records and show that only 45.5% of the entries in tools were exactly matched by the authority records, while 63.8% of the variant forms found in the tools did not appear in the authority file. However, when considering entry element only, 92.9% of the entries in tools were matched by the authority records. Appendices include the data collection sheet, lists of painters used in the study, abbreviations for bibliographic tools, and problem categories. (Contains 21 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 934

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERSONAL NAME FORMATION OF VICTORIAN ERA PAINTERS: A COMPARISON OF SCHOLAR-CREATED BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS AND THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS NAME AUTHORITY FILE

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Suzanne H. Brewster

May, 1996

IR056209

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Suzanne H. Brewster
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PERSONAL NAME FORMATION OF VICTORIAN ERA PAINTERS:
A COMPARISON OF SCHOLAR-CREATED BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS AND THE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS NAME AUTHORITY FILE

Research shows that humanities scholars assign importance to the use of personal names. This study compares the formation of the names of Victorian Era painters found in selected bibliographic tools created by humanities scholars to the formation of names found in the Library of Congress authority file. A purposive sample of 57 painters, divided into twelve problem categories derived from Chapter 22 of *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, was searched in six bibliographic tools and in the name authority file. Comparisons were made of the variant forms found in the tools and in the 100 and 400 fields of the MARC authority records and show that only 45.5% of the entries in tools were exactly matched by the authority records, while 63.8% of the variant forms found in the tools did not appear in the authority file. However, when considering entry element only, 92.9% of the entries in tools were matched by the authority records.

Master's Research Paper by

Suzanne H. Brewster

B.S., Bowling Green University, 1972

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1996

Approved by

Advisor Lechura H. Connell Date April 2, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	2
RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	9
METHODOLOGY	10
RESULTS	16
CATEGORY 1	17
CATEGORY 2	20
CATEGORY 3	23
CATEGORY 4	27
CATEGORY 5	30
CATEGORY 6	31
CATEGORY 7	36
CATEGORY 8	36
CATEGORY 9	41
CATEGORY 10	41
CATEGORY 11	43
CATEGORY 12	46
SUMMARY	52
CONCLUSIONS	64
WORKS CITED	66
APPENDIX A	68
APPENDIX B	70
APPENDIX C	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Findings for Choice Among Different Names	18
2A	Findings for Painters Using Pseudonyms	21
2B	Use of Pseudonyms	22
3A	Findings for Painters with Change of Name	24
3B	Use of Later Name	26
4	Findings for Painters with Different Forms of the Same Name (Fullness or Spelling)	28
5	Findings for Painters with Compound Surnames	32
6A	Findings for Painters with Hyphenated Surnames	34
6B	Use of First Element	35
7	Findings for Painters with Separately Written Prefixes	37
8A	Findings for Painters Using Titles of Nobility	39
8B	Use of Titles	40
9	Findings for Painters Using Initials	42
10A	Findings for Painters Using British Terms of Honor	44
10B	Use of British Terms of Honor	45
11A	Findings for Painters Using Married Terms of Address	47
11B	Use of Terms of Address for Married Women	49
12A	Findings for Additions to Distinguish Names	50
12B	Use of Dates	51
13	Summary of Findings for All Categories	53
14A	Summary of Matching for All Categories with No Duplication	55
14B	Summary of Variants for All Categories	57
15	Agreement/Disagreement in Tools	59
16	Summary of Matches for Entry Element Only	63

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer would like to thank Dr. Tschera Harkness Connell for suggesting the problem studied in this paper and for acting as advisor.

Introduction

As information professionals attempt to meet the needs of scholars, a significant issue is the degree of correspondence between research tools created by library and information science professionals and tools created by, and used by, scholars in any particular academic discipline. The library user has a right to expect a high level of both recall and precision in catalog search results; that is, that the search results will reflect *all* that the library has to offer regarding the object of the search (recall), and that the search results reflect information concerning *only* the object of the search (precision). If the user searches for a personal name which is in a form other than that which is established for use in the library catalog, and if, in addition, the searched form is not one which is used for a cross reference, the search will fail. Thus, librarians will have failed to serve this user at all for this particular search.

Chapter 22 of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, second revision (*AACR2R*), provides the rules which librarians are to use for constructing uniform headings for personal names. These rules are used in forming the name headings and cross references found in the records of the Library of Congress Name Authority File. Do we, as librarians using these rules, form personal name headings for library catalogs in such a way that a scholar can experience a high degree of both precision and recall in catalog searches?

Miller (1994) has studied this issue as regards to Victorian women writers. Using a purposive sample of 52 personal names, she found all variant forms of these names appearing in bibliographic tools which had been created by scholars in the field of literature. She then compared these variant forms with the established name headings and cross references for the same individuals as they appear in the Library of Congress Name Authority File (LC NAF). Her findings indicate that in over 40%

of the cases the variant forms of names that appeared in the bibliographic tools used in the field of literature appeared in neither the uniform heading nor in the cross references of the LC NAF.

It would be useful to examine the efficacy of the library catalog in another academic discipline: the fine arts. This descriptive study compares a purposive sample of names of Victorian Era painters as they appear (together with variant forms) in scholar-created bibliographic tools to the formation of name headings and cross references (for those same individuals) as they appear in the Library of Congress Name Authority File. In addition, the variant forms of names found in the various tools are examined. The purpose is to determine whether or not significant discrepancies exist (1) between names as found in the LC NAF, representing headings formed according to *AACR2R* rules, and the names as found in the scholar-created tools, and (2) among the forms of names used in the scholar-created tools.

Literature Review

Two areas of the literature relating to this problem need to be examined: the information needs of fine arts scholars and authority control of personal names.

While no literature was found on the information needs of fine arts scholars *per se*, there is a body of literature on that of humanities scholars. Look where one may, it is difficult to find a clear definition for "the humanities." Are the fine arts included? Stone (1982) discusses this definitional problem in her paper on the information needs of humanities scholars. One view presented is that the humanities have as their purpose "recovering, preserving and interpreting the cultural heritage of

mankind." (Stone 1982, 293) Stone points out that while the boundaries of the humanities may not be clear cut, the arts are generally included.

There is a traditional understanding that humanities scholars find books more important than journal articles, that they are less concerned about how current information is, that they work in isolation and do not collaborate with fellow scholars, and that they find little value in contact with other scholars. Some research has supported these views: that humanities scholars tend to work alone, do not delegate literature searches and place a heavier reliance on monographs than scholars in the sciences or the social sciences (Stone 1982). In addition, works which were published quite some time ago may remain definitive for a humanities scholar (Stone 1982).

More recently, Pandit has found that not all of these views hold true. The results of her qualitative study of informal communications among scholars in the fields of philosophy, literature, and history reveal that humanities scholars generally believe books are important mechanisms for formal communication, while philosophers need the rapidity of journal articles (Pandit 1992). Further, she found that humanities scholars do not work in quite the isolation as has been traditionally understood. While there are still some isolationists, many scholars find informal communication with colleagues to be important to their work, particularly communication with others interested in similar areas of research. Manuscript exchanges were found to be a useful means of communications in the humanities.

Wiberley studied the language of the humanities and examined the precision of access terms used in representative humanities indexes. His findings show that "singular proper terms [personal names] constitute more than half of the substantive vocabulary...of the humanities" (Wiberley 1988, 3). He concludes that it is important for "indexers...to perform high-quality authority work." (Wiberley 1988, 25)

There are other indications that proper names form an important part of the humanities vocabulary. Siegfried and Wilde (1990) conducted an exploratory study of online search patterns of humanities scholars at the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities. The scholars included those with interests in art history, architecture, social history, philosophy, history of music, classics, and social and cultural anthropology. While the authors caution that the results are preliminary and should not be taken as scientific, it was observed that the humanities scholars exhibited a preference for personal name searching.

The quality of authority work is important to all library users. Whether or not an individual searcher is aware of it, the degrees of both precision and recall of a search are directly affected by the level of authority control maintained in the catalog. The Paris Principles, which are the basis of our cataloging rules, state that one of the functions of the catalog is to allow the user to discover which works by a particular author are held by the library. Thus all works by that author are to be entered under a uniform heading regardless of the number of names or forms an author has used. In addition, each uniform heading may represent only one author and, thus, the heading must differentiate the author from all others of the same name.

In the case of a personal name search, the user has a right to expect that his/her search results will reflect *all* that the library has to offer by and/or about the individual in question (recall). Further, the user has the right to expect the search results to reflect information concerning *only* that particular individual and not about a similarly-named person whose name heading has not been differentiated in the catalog (precision). These user expectations can be met only through accurate and meaningful authority control. Authority control for a personal name ensures that a unique and standard form of name is used consistently for a given individual throughout the catalog.

In the instance of a person known only by one name, authority

control is routine. But what about less clear cut cases where, say, individuals use more than one name, have compound surnames, or undergo a change of name?

We need to understand how authority records are created and used. According to Clack (1990), when a personal name is recognized as being new to the public catalog, an authority record is created. Upon subsequently encountering the name, the librarian will check the name against the authority file in order to establish whether or not it is new to the public catalog. The presence of a record for the name in the authority file tells the librarian that the name is not new. Thus, no new authority record is created for that name; such a record is created only once.

How often does it happen that a person is known by more than one name or by more than one form? In her study of personal names in the library catalog, Fuller examined "the extent to which person's names appear in different forms in their work (Fuller 1989, 75) and the types of those differences. Her sample was drawn from a card catalog at the University of Chicago and her results show that in 82.4% of the cases only one form was used. However, in the 17.6% of the cases where more than one name was used, the most commonly occurring difference was in the entry element. Weintraub (1991) carried out a similar study at the University of California. In 18.5% of the bibliographic transcriptions examined more than one personal name was used. She further found that a different entry element (other than word order inversions) accounted for 10.2% of the variations in authority record headings and references.

In examining the problem of personal name formation as found in library catalogs, one could focus on just one catalog, at a large research library, for instance. However, librarians in this country (and others) have available to them a tool which reflects expected and accepted usage in a large pool of libraries. The Library of Congress Name Authority File contains the established forms of name headings and variant forms to be used in making

cross references. These uniform name headings and cross references are constructed using the rules in Part 2 of *AACR2R*.

Kellough (1988) examined the importance that the Library of Congress Name Authority File has in authority control of names. While he found that there were some discrepancies in the LC NAF and that it is not all inclusive, "its value remains immeasurable as it is the only comprehensive resource for authority control" (Kellough 1988, 5).

Taylor (1992) sampled records found in the Online Union Catalog of OCLC, recorded personal names found in the 100 and 700 MARC fields of these records and then searched for these name access points in the LC Name Authority File. A subsequent search for bibliographic records relating to these names was made. Taylor then compared variant forms of names found in both access points and statements of responsibility of the OLUC records with the variant forms as they appeared in the LC NAF. She found that 15.1% of the sampled records contained one or more names that differed from the established form contained in the corresponding LC NAF record. In addition, 5.2% of the variants represented an exact match to an LC NAF reference.

The evolution of automated catalogs has provided users with new features. Systems such as OSCAR or MELVYL permit key word searching so that the order of elements of a name need not affect search results. MELVYL provides automatic right-hand truncation. These are powerful features which allow increased rates of search success. Will these solve all problems in personal name searches for the fine arts scholar?

Of course, not all libraries are equipped with such automated catalog search systems; some will have card or book catalogs. Even for those libraries which do have these systems available it is not safe to assume that the search engine will eliminate frustration at the catalog. For example, consider the case of an artist referred to as Jaroslav Czermak or Jaroslav Cermak. Some reference tools list this individual only under Czermak. The

authority record for him contains no 100 or 400 field with this spelling. If a client (in a library which uses catalog headings and cross references which reflect the LC NAF) looks for the artist under "Czermak," the search will fail. Likewise in the case of a corporate name: Cartographia. This is a Hungarian map publisher whose name appears on many of its maps as "Cartographia." A library client searching the catalog for maps published by this company (again, in a library which uses headings and cross references which reflect the LC NAF) will have no luck unless s/he knows or guesses that in Hungarian the name will most likely be spelled "Kartographia."

Thomas (1984) studied the need for personal name cross references in one such search system. Her findings show that 57% of personal name cross references are still needed. Watson and Taylor (1987) used a random sample of the LC NAF in order to study the need for cross references in an automated environment. Their findings show that 68.3% of personal name records contain no references and that a further 14.5% contain only those references which would not be needed in a system equipped with keyword searching and automatic right-hand truncation abilities. This leaves, however, 17.2% of personal name records which are true variants and need cross references. The results of these studies indicate that there is still room for work to be done in ascertaining whether or not librarians using *AACR2R* rules to make these cross references are doing so in the best possible way in terms of service to users.

Miller (1994) has examined authority control of personal names of Victorian women writers. She used Chapter 22 of *AACR2R* to derive twelve problem categories in the formation of personal name headings. These problem categories fell into three groups: Choice among different names, choice of entry element, and choice of addition to names.

Four bibliographic tools which had been created by scholars in the field of literature were identified: two of the tools were

humanities indexes, one was a standard biographical source and the fourth was a bibliography of works held by the British Library which were written by women and which had been published between the years 1801 and 1900. Then using the 12 problem categories, Miller drew a purposive sample of 52 names of Victorian women writers from the four bibliographic tools. All variant forms of names for the 52 writers were searched in these bibliographic tools and recorded.

Miller then searched these names in the LC NAF MARC records and recorded the established headings from the 100 fields of the MARC records together with the forms found in the cross reference fields (400 fields of the MARC record). She compared the variant forms found in the bibliographic tools with the forms found in the 100 and 400 fields of the MARC record of the LC NAF.

A total of 319 variant forms were found for the names of the fifty-two writers: of these, 195 variant forms were unique to the LC NAF. Thirty-six of the 319 variants were unique to the bibliographic tools. Eighty variants were found in 104 entries in the bibliographic tools and 36 of these were unique. Thus 45% of the variant forms as they appeared in the bibliographic tools did not appear in either the 100 or the 400 fields of the LC NAF records.

Thus, Miller has given us one examination of the efficacy of *AACR2R* rules in forming personal names of women who were writing in England in the Victorian Era. This study considers the same problem for another area of the humanities and parallels Miller's study as regards the time frame in which the individuals operated. Because of the author's personal interests this study examines the efficacy of *AACR2R* rules as it applies to the personal names of individuals who were painting during the Victorian Era.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which differences exist between forms of names of Victorian Era painters found in bibliographic tools created by scholars in the field of the fine arts and forms of names of those same individuals as they appear in the uniform heading of the LC NAF.

A further purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which the variant forms of names of Victorian Era painters as found in the scholar-created bibliographic tools are found in the cross references (400 fields) contained in the LC NAF. In addition, this study compares the variant forms as found in the bibliographic tools for agreement among the tools themselves.

For the purposes of this study Victorian painters are defined as those individuals, of any nationality or origin, who were painting at any time during the period of 1837 - 1901, the years of Victoria's reign. In order for the name to appear in a bibliographic tool, the painter will need to have been the subject of at least a minimum amount of scholarly study.

Scholar-created bibliographic tools are those finding aids and biographic resources which have been created by fine arts scholars. Any bibliographic tools created by librarians using the rules of *AACR2R* do not fall into this category. Front matter of such works, as well as research guides in the fine arts were used to determine this.

Variant forms of names included all the names by which a particular person was known, including pseudonyms, titles, terms of address, and terms of honor.

Uniform name headings are the form of an individual's name as found in the MARC 100 field of the Library of Congress Name Authority File as available through OCLC. Cross references are those forms of names found in the MARC 400 field(s) of the LC NAF as available through OCLC.

Methodology

In order to compare the names of Victorian painters as they appear in standard bibliographic tools and as they appear in the LC Name Authority File, the following steps were followed: (1) deriving the problem categories from *AACR2R*, (2) selecting the bibliographic tools, (3) identifying the names of painters and assigning them to problem categories, (4) searching the bibliographic tools for the names, (5) searching the LC NAF for the names, and (6) repeating steps 3 through 5 for any category with fewer than two names.

Chapter 22 of *AACR2R* states the rules for constructing the uniform heading for personal names. Following are fourteen problem categories derived from this chapter:

A. Choice of name
   1. Choice among different names
   2. Pseudonyms
   3. Separate bibliographic identities
   4. Change of name
   5. Different forms of the same name (fullness or spelling)

B. Choice of entry element
   6. Compound surnames
   7. Hyphenated surnames
   8. Surnames with separately written prefixes
   9. Titles of nobility
   10. Entry under initials or letters
   11. Entry under phrase

C. Choice of additions to names
   12. British terms of honor
   13. Terms of address of married women
   14. Additions to distinguish identical names (dates, fuller forms)

During data collection two categories were dropped due to a lack of data. These were the categories for separate bibliographic identities and entry under phrase. This left 12 problem categories for analysis.

For each problem category, at least two names of Victorian painters which illustrated the category were identified using scholar-created bibliographic tools. For the purposes of this study Victorian painters were defined as those individuals, of any nationality or origin, who were painting at any time during the period of 1837 - 1901, the years of Victoria's reign. The inclusion of a painter's name in a bibliographic tool indicates that the painter has been the subject of at least a minimum amount of scholarly study.

After a name was assigned to a problem category, it was further assigned to all other problem categories for which it was illustrative. Therefore, some names appear in multiple categories, but each problem category contains at least two unique names which were not initially assigned to another category.

This study adapted the data collection sheet designed by Miller for use in her study of name formation of Victorian women writers. A sample of this instrument is included in Appendix A.

The collection sheet allowed room to record the problem category, the name of the painter, and the number of the LC authority record at the top left. Down the left side were 8 spaces that were used in recording variant forms of the name found in the scholar-created bibliographic tools and/or in the MARC records during data collection.

These variants then became the row labels of a matrix at the right side of the sheet. The column labels were abbreviations for the titles of the various bibliographic tools used and the LC 100 and 400 fields of the MARC record of the LC NAF. The 100 field of the MARC authority record contains the uniform heading for a personal name as established using *AACR2R* rules (or headings compatible with those rules), and the 400 field(s) provide cross

references from unused headings. A check mark was placed in a square of the matrix corresponding to the bibliographic tool or MARC field in which a variant form of the name was found.

At the bottom of the sheet was a space for noting biographical information on the painter.

The next step was selecting the bibliographic reference tools which represent the work of fine arts scholars. There were two criteria for the selection of these scholar-created bibliographic tools:

1. The tool must be one created by scholars in the field, rather than by librarians using the rules of *AACR2R*, as otherwise there would be no basis for comparison. The preface, introduction, and any other front matter, as well as research guides in the fine arts, were used to determine whether or not this criterion was met.

2. The tool must be a standard tool for use as a finding aid by fine arts scholars. The research guides to the fine arts, *Art Research Methods and Resources: A Guide to Finding Art Information* by Lois Swan Jones and *Visual Arts Research: A Handbook* by Elizabeth B. Pollard were used to determine whether or not this criterion was met.

Using these criteria, the following works were chosen as the scholar-created bibliographic tools which form the basis for a comparison with the LC NAF:

A Biographical Dictionary of Women Artists in Europe and America Since 1850 by Penny Dunford, 1990.

Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers, 1903.

Cyclopedia of Painters and Painting by John Denison Champlin, 1927.

The Dictionary of Victorian Painters by Christopher Wood, 1978.

Dictionnaire ...des Peintres..., by E. Benezit, 1976.

Index to Artistic Biography by Patricia Pate Havlice, 1978.

With the exception of the last-named work, all of the above contain biographical information on artists within the framework suggested by each title. The Dunford work covers all types of artists, but all are women who were working from 1850 through 1990 in Europe and America. *Bryan's Dictionary* attempts to cover all painters and engravers, from any part of the world through about 1902, while the *Cyclopedia of Painters and Painting* is meant to include all painters, of any nationality, and for any time period up through the mid-1920's.

The Dictionary of Victorian Painters limits inclusion to those artists who exhibited at least one painting in any show in England during Victoria's reign. The Benezit work is a standard biographical work in the French language and covers many types of artists of any nationality and does not set a limit on time period. The *Index to Artistic Biography*, also a well known standard reference work, contains no biographical information other than dates, but lists sources for biographical information on artists of all types, times, and locations.

The names of Victorian painters were identified using the biographical information in the first five of the listed bibliographic tools to determine which artists were painters who worked during the years 1837 - 1901. Once a name was identified, it was then searched in each of the bibliographic tools with all possible variant forms being searched until the name was found or until all possibilities were exhausted. All variant forms of a name were recorded as row labels on the data collection sheet and check marks placed in the appropriate matrix cell to indicate in which tool(s) the variant form was found. Notes such as birth and death dates, titles of significant works (paintings and, in some cases, books), and other names and forms used (along with any

reasons and dates given for these other names) were also recorded to aid in subsequent searches.

As variants of the names were identified, it was found that, some individuals were known by a name (or names) which fell into more than one category. In such cases the name, which had been assigned to an initial problem category, was also secondarily assigned to each problem category for which it was illustrative, Therefore some names appear in multiple categories. However, identification of names continued until each problem category contained at least two names which had not been initially assigned to any other problem category.

Following this, the names of Victorian painters found in at least one of the bibliographic tools were the subjects of subsequent searches in the LC NAF. The 100 field contains the uniform heading for a personal name used by the Library of Congress and either formed according to the rules of Chapter 22 of *AACR2R* or formed according to earlier cataloging codes and considered compatible with *AACR2R*. Forms of names not to be used in the catalog are contained in the 400 fields. There may be no 400 field for a given uniform heading; equally, there may be multiple occurrences of the 400 field for a given name with many variant forms. In building and maintaining the catalog, cross references are to be made from the form(s) appearing in the 400 field(s) to the uniform heading appearing in the 100 field.

When an authority record was found for a particular name, the record was printed. Variant forms of names were recorded on the data collection sheet; forms previously found in the bibliographic tools were given a check mark in the appropriate column, either the 100 or 400 field. In order to receive a check mark, the name match had to be exact as to fullness, order and spelling. The use of a hyphen in a surname or entry element affects the way in which a name is entered in the tools and the way in which a search is conducted. With the exception of a hyphen in a surname, variations in punctuation, such as the use of parentheses were

disregarded. Information contained in subfields ǂc (terms of address and titles) and ǂq (fuller forms) in the 100 and 400 fields were considered relevant and affected the exactness of the match.

Since not all of the bibliographic tools provided birth and death dates, and those that did, did not provide them uniformly, the information contained in subfield ǂd (birth and death dates) was not considered relevant to a name match. These dates, whenever available, were used only to ascertain that the correct individual's name had been found.

Initially, the names of 140 painters were searched in the bibliographic tools. These 140 names were then searched in the LC NAF. The Authority File contained records for 56 of these names, which filled ten of the fourteen categories with one name assigned to an eleventh category, that for entry under initials.

An additional 34 names, in aggregate, were identified and assigned to the category for entry under initials and that for additions to distinguish among different individuals with the same name. These 34 names were searched in the bibliographic tools, variants were recorded and the names were subsequently searched in the LC NAF. Both of these categories were filled.

It was not possible to identify names of painters from the relevant era to fill the category for separate bibliographic identities nor for the category for entry under phrase. Thus these two categories were deleted from the study. The result was a final purposive sample of fifty-seven painters in twelve problem categories. Appendix B lists the names of painters included in the final sample, the bibliographic tools in which the names were found and the LC authority record numbers.

In analyzing the data, a comparison was first made between the variant form(s) found in the bibliographic tools and the form found in the 100 field of the LC MARC authority record, which provides the established heading. If no match was found, the form or forms were compared to the 400 field(s) of the authority

record. For each name of a painter, tallies were kept for the number of entries in the bibliographic tools, the number of variants in the tools, the matches between the tools and the MARC 100 field, the matches between the tools and the MARC 400 field(s), the number of variants unique to the LC NAF records, and the number of variants unique to the bibliographic tools.

Results

The final sample comprised the names of fifty-seven Victorian Era painters; these 57 names were searched in six bibliographic tools and in the Library of Congress Name Authority File. The names were assigned to twelve problem categories which had been derived from Chapter 22 of *AACR2R*.

In discussing the results, each category will be defined as the search results are presented. In the cases of both the discussions and the tables, the following definitions apply. The number of *entries* was defined as the number of bibliographic tools in which a name was found in some form. The number of *variants* was defined as the number of variant forms in which a name was found over all the tools, that is the number of unique presentations of a name. For example, Juliette Bonheur (sometimes called Peyrol) was found in 5 of the bibliographic tools (5 *entries*); three of the tools listed her as Bonheur, Juliette and the other two listed her as Peyrol, Juliette Bonheur. This constitutes 2 *variants*.

In the summary tables for each problem category there appears a column indicating that the entries in the tools were matched by a MARC 400 field of the LC authority record. Some of the entries in such columns contain the indicator "N/A"; this occurs whenever the authority record in question contained no 400 field.

Appendix C provides a list of problem categories used in the study, and the painters assigned to each.

Choice of name

There are four problem categories which fall into the area of choice among different names.

1. Choice among different names.
2. Pseudonyms.
3. Changes of name.
4. Different forms of the same name.

The general rule, 22.1A tells the librarian to use the name by which a person is commonly known. Rule 22.1B informs the librarian that when a person works in a non-verbal medium, as does a painter, the name by which he or she is generally known should be determined from reference sources in the painter's native language or the language of the country where the painter is active. In the Victorian Era, many painters traveled to centers of artistic activity and were active in areas with diverse languages. This factor may contribute to some confusion and/or disagreement about the painter's name.

Category 1: Choice among different names

According to Rule 22.2A, when a person has used more than one name (not including pseudonyms), the librarian should choose as the basis for a name heading, the name which is predominant, if there is one. In cases where no one name seem to predominate, the librarian, should choose (in the order given): the name used most frequently on the person's work; the name used most frequently in reference works; or the latest name.

The names of nine painters were given primary assignment to this category and two further names, with primary assignment in other categories, were found to illustrate this category as well. Each of these eleven painters was known by more than one name or by more than one form of the same name. Table 1 summarizes the findings of the searches on the names of these painters.

The names appeared forty-three times in twenty-seven variants in the bibliographic tools. In 44.2% of the cases (19 entries) the

Table 1

Summary of findings for choice among different names

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte	4	1	5	2	5	0	7
Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, Anna	1	1	2	2	0	0	2
Brickdale, Eleanor	0	2	4	3	1	2	4
Canon, Hans	4	N/A	5	2	0	1	2
Jacquemart, Nelie	1	N/A	4	3	0	2	3
Jopling, Louise	4	1	5	2	5	0	7
Louise, Princess	0	1	2	2	5	1	7
Nanteuil, Celestin Leboeuf	0	0	4	3	4	3	7
Severn, Ann Mary	2	2	5	4	1	1	5

Table 1 (cont'd.)

Summary of findings for choice among different names

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Edwards, Mary Ellen*		3	0	4	2	3	1	5
Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan*		0	N/A	3	2	1	2	3
TOTALS	11	19	8	43	27	25	13	52

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 19/43 = 44.2%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 8/43 = 18.6%

Total % entries matching LC = 27/43 = 62.8%

% variants only in LC = 25/52 = 48.1%

% variants only in tools = 13/52 = 25.0%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 13/27 = 48.2%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

entry in the tool matched the 100 field of the MARC authority record; a further 18.6% of the cases (8 entries) the entry in the tool matched the 400 field, for a total of 62.8% of matches between tools and authority records.

A total of 52 variants were found for the names of these eleven painters. Twenty-five (48.1%) were unique to the LC NAF and thirteen (25.0%) were unique to the tools. Thirteen of the 27 variants (48.2%) which were found in the tools did not appear in the authority records.

For three of the painters, the 100 and 400 fields of the authority records provide 100% matches to the variants used in the tools: Bartholomew, Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, and Jopling. Some factors in match failures are as follows: one reference tool misspelled Brickdale as "Bricklade"; Nelie Jacquemart was listed in one tool and in the 100 field of the authority record as Jacquemart, Nelie Barbe Hyacinthe; the other three tools in which her name was found did not include the additional two given names.

Category 2: Pseudonyms

When a person consistently used a pseudonym, Rule 22.2B1 directs the librarian to use the pseudonym for a name heading and to make cross references from the real name.

Four painters were given primary assignment to this category and one additional name with primary assignment in another category was found to illustrate the category as well. Tables 2A and 2B summarize the results of the searches. These 5 painters were found in the bibliographic tools sixteen times in a total of fourteen variant forms; thus the tools show a high degree of inconsistency. It should be noted, however that only in the cases of Henriette Brown and Marcello were the variants found in the tools due to disagreement in the entry element.

Six of the sixteen (37.5%) entries in the tools matched the 100 field of the authority record; two of the entries (12.5%) matched the 400 field. This gives a total of 50% matches between the tools and the LC NAF. The names were found in a total of 27

Table 2A

Summary of findings for painters using pseudonyms

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Browne, Henriette (Desaux, Sophie)		1	0	4	4	2	3	6
Carolus-Duran (Durand, Emile-Auguste)		1	1	3	3	2	1	5
Marval, Jacqueline (Vellet, Marie Josephine)		2	0	2	1	2	0	3
Marcello (Affry, Adele d')		0	1	3	3	4	2	7
Munkacsy, Mihaly* (Lieb, Michael)		2	0	4	3	3	2	6
TOTALS	5	6	2	16	14	13	8	27

% entries in tools matching LC 100 =6/16 = 37.5%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 2/16 = 12.5%

Total % entries matching LC = 8/16 = 50.0%

% variants only in LC = 13/27 = 48.2%

% variants only in tools = 8/27 = 29.6%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 8/14 = 57.1%

* This painter has primary assignment in another category but has been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

Table 2B

Use of Pseudonyms

		# Entries under pseudonym in tools	# Entries in tools	Pseudonym used in LC 100	Pseudonym used in LC 400
Browne, Henriette		1	4	1	0
Carolus-Duran		3	3	1	0
Marval, Jacqueline		2	2	1	0
Marcello		1	3	0	1
Munkacsy, Mihaly		4	4	1	0
TOTALS	5	11	16	4	1

% of entries in tools using pseudonym = 11/16 = 68.8%

% of authority records containing pseudonym = (4 + 1)/5 = 100%

variants, 13 (48.2%) of which were unique to the authority records and 8 of which (29.6%) were unique to the tools. Of the 14 variants found in the tools, 8 (57.1%) did not appear in the authority records.

A further point of interest is that, of the sixteen entries in the tools, eleven (68.8%) used the pseudonym as the entry heading. In four cases the pseudonym appeared in the 100 field of the LC NAF and in the one remaining case the pseudonym appeared in a 400 field. Thus the pseudonym was found in 100% of the authority records.

Category 3: Change of name

Rule 22.2C1 tells the librarian that when a person has undergone a change of name (other than to a pseudonym), the latest name should be chosen for a name heading, unless there is overriding reason to believe that an earlier form or name will predominate.

The names of four painters were given primary assignment to this category and a further five with primary assignment elsewhere were found to illustrate this category as well. All nine were women whose names had changed due to marriage. Tables 3A and 3B summarize the findings for this category. In only 18, or one-half, of the thirty-six times the names appeared in the bibliographic tools was the later name used. In seven of the nine cases (77.8%) the later name was used in either the 100 or a 400 field of the authority record.

The names of the nine painters appeared 36 times in the tools, in 24 variant forms; again there is little consistency among the tools. Fifty percent (18 out of 36) of the entries in the tools matched the MARC 100 field and 19.4% (7 out of 36) of the entries matched a 400 field. Thus, even though the tools are inconsistent in this category, a scholar using a name as it appeared in a bibliographic tool would find the correct place in the catalog 69.4% of the time.

The names were found in a total of 47 variants with 23

Table 3A

Summary of findings for painters with change of name

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Bisschop, Suze (Bisschop-Robertson, Suze)	0	0	2	2	1	2	3
Bonheur, Juliette (Peyrol, Juliette Bonheur)	3	0	5	2	2	1	4
Blunden, Anna E. (Martino, Anna E.)	1	0	4	4	2	3	6
Dewing, Maria Richards (Oakey, Maria Richards)	0	2	4	4	4	2	8
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte * (Turnbull, Anne Charlotte)	4	1	5	2	5	0	7
Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, Anna * (Bilinska, Anna)	1	1	2	2	0	0	2
Edwards, Mary Ellen * (Staples, Mary Ellen)	3	0	4	2	3	1	5

Table 3A (cont'd.)

Summary of findings for painters with change of name

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Jopling, Louise * (Jopling-Rowe, Louise)		4	1	5	2	5	0	7
Severn, Ann Mary * (Newton, Ann Mary)		2	2	5	4	1	1	5
TOTALS	9	18	7	36	24	23	10	47

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 18/36 = 50.0%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 7/36 = 19.4%

Total % entries matching LC = 25/36 = 69.4%

% variants only in LC = 23/47 = 48.9%

% variants only in tools = 10/47 = 21.3%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 10/24 = 41.7%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

37

38

Table 3B

Use of later name

	# Entries under later name in tools	# Entries in tools	Later name used in LC 100	Later name used in LC400
Bisschop, Suze	2	2	0	0
Bonheur, Juliette	1	5	0	1
Blunden, Anna E.	1	4	0	1
Dewing, Maria Richards	4	4	1	0
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte	5	5	1	0
Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, Anna	1	2	1	0
Edwards, Mary Ellen	1	4	0	0
Jopling, Louise	0	5	0	1
Severn, Ann Mary	3	5	1	0
TOTALS 9	18	36	4	3

% of entries in tools using later name = 18/36 = 50.0%

% of authority records containing later name = (4 + 3)/9 = 77.8%

(48.9%) of these being unique to the LC NAF and 10 (21.3%) being unique to the tools. Ten of the 24 variants (41.7%) found in the tools did not appear in the authority records.

Category 4: Choice among different forms of the same name (fullness or spelling)

The names in this category are governed by Rules 22.3A1 and 22.3D1. Rule 22.3A1 directs the librarian to use the most commonly occurring form of a name or, if no one form predominates, to use the latest form. If there is doubt about which form is the latest, the fuller form is to be used.

Rule 22.3D1 covers differences in spelling. Preference is given to spellings which result from official changes in orthography, or, if this is not applicable, to the the predominant spelling.

Table 4 summarizes the findings for this category. The names of six painters were assigned to this category and two others with primary assignment elsewhere were found to illustrate this problem as well. These names appeared in the bibliographic tools twenty-nine times in twenty variant forms, again showing a low degree of consistency. In 34.5% (10 out of 29) of the entries there was a match with the 100 field of the authority record. In a further 10.3% (3 out of 29) there was a match between the tools and a 400 field, yielding a total of 44.8% of matches between the tools and the LC NAF.

The names appeared in a combined total of 32 variant forms, of which 12 (37.5%) were unique to the authority file and 15 (46.9%) were unique to the tools. Of the 20 variants found in the tools, 15, or 75%, did not appear in the authority records.

Choice of entry element

After the name to be used in a heading is determined the librarian must decide which part of that name will be used as the entry element for the heading. Five problem categories fall into

Table 4

Summary of findings for painters with different forms of same name (fullness or spelling)

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Ansingh, Lizzy (*also* Elisabeth & Elizabeth)	0	1	2	2	1	1	3
Bonheur, Rosa (*also* Rosalie & Rosaline)	3	N/A	5	3	0	2	3
Czermak, Jaroslav (*also* Cermak)	2	0	4	3	2	2	5
Lafaye, Prosper (*also* Lafaist, Lafait, Lafaye)	2	0	4	3	2	2	5
Munkacsy, Mihaly (*also* Michael)	2	0	4	3	3	2	6
Smedley, W.T. (*also* William Thomas)	1	2	3	2	0	2	2

Table 4 (cont'd.)

Summary of findings for painters with different forms of same name (fullness or spelling)

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence * (*also* Laurenz)		0	0	4	2	3	2	5
Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan * (*also* Szekely von Adamos)		0	N/A	3	2	1	2	3
TOTALS	8	10	3	29	20	12	15	32

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 10/29 = 34.5%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 3/29 = 10.3%

Total % entries matching LC = 13/29 = 44.8%

% variants only in LC = 12/32 = 37.5%

% variants only in tools = 15/32 = 46.9%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 15/20 = 75.0%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

this area as follows:

5. Compound surnames
6. Hyphenated surnames
7. Surnames with separately written prefixes
8. Titles of nobility
9. Entry under initials or letters

These five categories are governed by the general rule for entry element, Rule 22.4A which directs the librarian to choose the entry element according to the painter's language or country of origin or residence. Only if it is known that the painter preferred to deviate from that norm is a different element to be chosen as the one for entry. Rule 22.5A provides that the surname should be the entry element unless subsequent rules decree otherwise.

Section 22.5C covers the choice of entry element for compound surnames. The preliminary rule, 22.5C1, directs that the subsequent rules in the section be applied in the order given and directs the librarian to make cross references from elements not chosen as the entry element. Rule 22.5C2 provides that a compound surname be entered according to the element by which the painter preferred to be entered.

Category 5: Compound surnames

Rule 22.5C4 tells the librarian to enter the painter's name under the first element of a compound surname unless the language is Portuguese. None of the six painters assigned to this category was Portuguese. The names appeared 23 times in 12 variant forms in the tools. The entries in the tools matched the 100 MARC field in 34.8% (8 out of 23) of the cases and the tool entries matched a 400 field 17.4% (4 out of 23) of the time. This totals to 52.2% matches with the LC NAF.

The names were found in a combined total of 29 variants. Seventeen of these (58.6%) were unique to the authority record and 8 (27.6%) were unique to the tools. Eight of the 12 variants found in the tools (66.7%) were not matched by either the 100 or

the 400 fields of the authority records. Results for this category are summarized in Table 5.

Two of the names in this category, Fortuny Y Carbo and Turpin de Crisse, appeared in only one variant each in the tools. Each of these names also showed a 100% match with the authority record, Fortuny Y Carbo with the a 400 field and Turpin de Crisse with the 100 field.

Madrazo Y Agudo showed no matches at all with the authority records; two of the tools in which this name appeared did not use the prefix "de" (which appeared in the authority file) and the one tool that did had the style "Don" embedded in the name: "Madrazo Y Agudo, Don Jose de". Puvis de Chavannes showed a failure to match three-fourths of the time; this was due to the inclusion of a second given name in the tools which was not included in the authority record. Similarly with the instance of Schnorr von Karolsfeld: one out of four entries did not match the LC NAF record and this was due to the inclusion of additional given names in that tool entry.

"Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan" appeared in that variant in 2 tools and as "Szekely von Adamos, Bertalan" in the third. The authority record listed this painter as "Szekely, Bertalan." Thus upon closer examination of the names in this category, we see that in 5 of 6 cases, the tools and the authority record are in agreement 100% of the time as regards the surname and entry element. In the last case there is disagreement as to what the surname is. Another way to look at this is that the tools and the LC NAF match for 83.3% of the names (5 of 6) on the item of interest in this category: entry element for compound surnames.

Category 6: Hyphenated surnames

The names in this category come under the rule of 22.5C3 which decrees that the entry element of a hyphenated surname be the first element. Five painters who were known consistently by hyphenated surnames were assigned to this category; one other name with primary assignment to another category was found to

Table 5

Summary of findings for painters with compound surnames

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Fortuny Y Carbo, Mariano		0	4	4	1	5	0	6
Madrazo Y Agudo, Jose		0	0	4	3	3	3	6
Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre		1	0	4	3	3	2	6
Schnorr von Karolsfeld, Julius		3	0	4	2	2	1	4
Turpin de Crisse, Lancelot		4	0	4	1	3	0	4
Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan		0	N/A	3	2	1	2	3
TOTALS	6	8	4	23	12	17	8	29

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 8/23 = 34.8%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 4/23 = 17.4%

Total % entries matching LC = 12/23 = 52.2%

% variants only in LC = 17/29 = 58.6%

% variants only in tools = 8/29 = 27.6%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 8/12 = 66.7%

illustrate this category as well. These 6 painters were entered in the bibliographic tools 20 times, appearing in 11 variant forms; 17 of the total 28 variants (60.7%) were unique to the authority records and 7 (25.0%) were unique to the tools. Of the 11 variants found in the tools, 7 (63.6%) did not appear in the authority records.

All but one of the entries used the first element of the hyphenated surname as the entry element. The LC NAF MARC records used the first element for entry 100% of the time. Six of the 20 (30.0%) entries matched the 100 field and five of the 20 matched a 400 field (25.0%) for a total of 55.0% matches. A summary of findings for this problem category appear in Tables 6A and 6B.

In three cases, Bastien-Lepage, Armand-Dumaresq, and Morel-Fatio, there existed a 100% match between the tool and the LC NAF (100 and 400 fields). Lawrence Alma-Tadema shows a 0% match because two of the entries spelled his given name as "Laurenz" while the other two tools and the LC NAF spelled it as "Lawrence"; no 400 field with the alternate spelling of the name appeared in the authority record. The two tools whose spelling of the given name matched with the LC NAF included his term of honor "Sir" in a different order from that prescribed by *AACR2*. Forbes-Robertson also shows a 0% match for his two entries. In each case the failure to match was due to disagreement as to placement of the term of honor "Sir."

Lady Laura Theresa Alma-Tadema appeared in three tools in three variants. None of these was matched by the MARC fields. This was due to the placement of the term of honor before the given name in two cases and the exclusion of her second given name in the third.

If one considers only the issue of entry element for hyphenated surnames, then combining the matches for the 100 and 400 fields, the names in this category match for 6 out of 6 names or 100%.

Table 6A

Summary of findings for painters with hyphenated surnames

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Alma-Tadema, Laurenz	0	0	4	2	3	2	5
Armand-Dumaresq, Charles	2	1	3	2	0	0	2
Bastien-Lepage, Jules	4	0	4	1	3	0	4
Forbes-Robertson, Johnston	0	0	2	2	4	2	6
Morel-Fatio, Antoine Leon	0	4	4	1	4	0	5
Alma-Tadema, Laura Theresa *	0	0	3	3	3	3	6
TOTALS 6	6	5	20	11	17	7	28

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 6/20 = 30.0%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 5/20 = 25.0%

Total % entries matching LC = 11/20 = 55.0%

% variants only in LC = 17/28 = 60.7%

% variants only in tools = 7/28 = 25.0%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 7/11 = 63.6%

* This painter has primary assignment in another category but has been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

51

52

Table 6B

Use of first element

		# Entries under 1st element in tools	# Entries in tools	First element used in LC 100
Alma-Tadema, Laura		3	3	1
Alma-Tadema, Laurenz		4	4	1
Armand-Dumaresq, Charles		3	3	1
Bastien-Lepage, Jules		4	4	1
Forbes-Robertson, Johnston		1	2	1
Morel-Fatio, Antoine Leon		4	4	1
TOTALS	6	19	20	6

% of entries in tools under 1st element = 19/20 = 95.0%

% of entries in LC under 1st element = 6/6 = 100%

Category 7: Names with separately written prefixes

A name with a separately written prefix presents another problem in the choice of entry element. When names include articles and/or prepositions, as do the names of the eight painters assigned to this category, they fall under the guidelines set out in Rule 22.5D1. The entries in the tools for these 8 names show a lack of close agreement, as the names occur 27 times in 21 variants. None of the tools entered any of the names by a prefix nor did the LC authority records. Table 7 summarizes findings for this category.

For complete names, however, there existed a match between the tools and the 100 fields only 37.0% of the time (10 out of 27) and the 400 fields matched with the tools only 7.4% of the time (2 out of 27). This amounts to a combined total of only 44.4% matches. The reasons for failure to match are largely due to variance in the extensiveness of the given names included in the entries, the inclusion of a style and its placement, and in one instance (Aligny, Claude d') both a different form of surname used in one bibliographic tool of the four in which he appeared (Caruelle d'Aligny) and variance in the given names.

The names of these eight painters were found in a total of 39 variant forms in all sources; 18 of these (46.2%) appeared only in the LC NAF and 14 (35.9%) of them appeared only in the tools. Fourteen of the 21 variants found in the tools (66.7%) did not appear in the authority records.

Category 8: Titles of nobility

Painters who bear titles of nobility, and who either used their titles in/on their works or who are listed in reference sources by their titles are to have their name headings formed such that the proper name in the title of nobility is the entry element. This is according to Rule 22.6A1. In the case of titles of the United Kingdom peerage which include territorial designations which are integral to the title, such territorial designations are to be included in the name heading as stated in

Table 7

Summary of findings for painters with separately written prefixes

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Aligny, Claude d'	0	1	4	4	5	3	9
Beers, Jan van	3	0	3	1	1	0	2
Engerth, Eduard von	0	0	2	2	2	2	4
Kaulbach, Wilhelm von	4	0	4	1	1	0	2
Pettenkofen, August von	1	0	3	2	1	1	3
Piloty, Karl von	1	0	3	3	1	2	4
Ramberg, Arthur Georg von	0	0	4	4	4	4	8
Schwind, Moritz von	1	1	4	4	3	2	7
TOTALS 8	10	2	27	21	18	14	39

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 10/27 = 37.0%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 2/27 = 7.4%

Total % entries matching tools = 12/27 = 44.4%

% variants only in LC = 18/39 =46.2%

% variants only in tools = 14/39 = 35.9%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 14/21 = 66.7%

Rule 22.6B1.

Three painters were assigned to this category; the first two fall under 22.6A1 only, while the third is governed by 22.6B1 also. An additional 4 names were found to illustrate this category as well. These four names also fall only under 22.6A1. Once again there is little agreement among the bibliographic tools about the forms of name headings. The seven names were entered in the tools 25 times in 21 variant forms; 15 of these 25 entries (60.0%) used the title in the name heading; 6 out of 7 (85.7%) of the authority records contained the title. Only 5 in 25 of the entries (20.0%) matched the LC 100 MARC field and 2 of 25 (8.0%) matched a 400 field for a total of 28% combined matches.

The names were found in a total of 46 variants; 17 of the 21 variants found in the tools (81.0%) did not appear in the authority records. Twenty-five of the total 46 variants (54.4%) were unique to the LC authority records and 17 (37.0%) were unique to the tools. Thus, there was little agreement in this category, which is summarized in Tables 8A and 8B.

Hendrik Leys bears the title of "Baron." Three of the tools used the title as did the LC authority file (a 100 field and three 400 fields.) The 100 field matched one tool entry. One tool entry did not use the title, one used the title but placed it before the given name, and the last tool disagreed with the other tools and the MARC record on the order of the given names.

Ferdinand Harrach also bears a title. The tools use the title of "Count" or "Comte," while the authority records use the title "Graf."

Frederick Leighton falls under Rule 22.6B1 since a territorial designation is an integral part of his title. Two of the tools list this individual as "Leighton, Sir Frederick," and two list him with neither title nor term of honor and each of these lists a variant spelling of his given name. The fifth tool enters him as "Leighton, Lord (Baron Leighton of Stretton)." The governing *AACR2R* rule directs that this painter's name heading be

Table 8A

Summary of findings for painters using titles of noblilty

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Harrach, Ferdinand von, Count	0	0	3	2	3	2	5
Leighton, Frederick, Baron	0	0	5	5	3	5	8
Leys, Hendrik, Baron	1	0	4	4	3	3	7
Castiglione-Colonna, Adele * Duchessa di	0	1	3	3	4	2	7
Louise, Princess (*also* Duchess of Argyll) *	0	1	2	2	5	1	7
Ramberg, Arthur, Freiherr von *	0	0	4	4	4	4	8
Turpin de Crisse, Lancelot, Comte *	4	0	4	1	3	0	4
TOTALS 7	5	2	25	21	25	17	46

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 5/25 = 20.0%
% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 2/25 = 8.0%
Total % entries matching LC = 7/25 = 28.0%

% variants only in LC = 25/46 = 54.4%
% variants only in tools = 17/46 = 37.0%
% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 17/21 = 81.0%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

Table 8B

Use of titles

		# Entries in tools using title	# Entries in tools	Title used in LC 100
Leys, Hendrik, Baron		3	4	1
Harrach, Ferdinand von, Count		3	3	1
Leighton, Frederick, Baron		1	5	1
Castiglione-Colonna, Adele, Duchessa di		2	3	1
Louise, Princess (*also* Duchess of Argyll)		0	2	0
Ramberg, Arthur, Freiherr von		2	4	1
Turpin de Crisse, Lancelot, Comte		4	4	1
TOTALS	7	15	25	6

% of entries in tools using title = 15/25 = 60.0%

% of authority records using title in 100 field = 6/7 = 85.7%

"Leighton of Stretton, Frederic Leighton, Baron." Thus, among the eight variants in which this name was found, there is no single point of agreement.

Category 9: Entry under initials

Relatively few painters of this era were known only by initials. For those who were, name headings fall under Rule 22.10A. This indicates that the librarian should enter the name in direct order and to include any words, phrases, or typographical devices that follow the initials. Two painters, each of whom were known at least occasionally by initials, were assigned to this category, which is summarized in Table 9.

The two names appeared six times in the tools, in four variant forms, again showing little agreement among the tools. Three out of six entries (50%) matched an LC MARC 100 field and 1 out of 6 (16.7%) matched a 400 field. Thus there was a 66.7% agreement between the tools and the authority records. The names were found in a total of 10 variant forms, 6 of which (60.0%) were unique to the LC authority records and 2 of which (20.0%) were unique to the bibliographic tools. One-half (2 out of 4) of the variants found in the bibliographic tools did not appear in the authority records.

Choice of additions to names

A librarian must determine not only which name and entry element to use for a heading, but also must determine whether or not any additions should be made to the name. Sections 22.12 through 22.20 of *AACR2R* list the rules pertaining to additions to names. This study is concerned with only three of the various possibilities covered in these sections: British terms of honor, terms of address for married women using their husbands' names, and the addition of dates to distinguish among identical names.

Category 10: British terms of honor

Rule 22.12B1 directs the librarian to add a British term of

Table 9

Summary of findings for painters using initials

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Boyle, Eleanor Vere (E.V.B.)		0	1	2	2	3	1	5
Edwards, Mary Ellen (M.E.E.)		3	0	4	2	3	1	5
TOTALS	2	3	1	6	4	6	2	10

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 3/6 = 50.0%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 1/6 = 16.7%

Total % entries matching LC = 4/6 = 66.7%

% variants only in LC = 6/10 = 60.0%

% variants only in tools = 2/10 = 20.0%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 2/4 = 50.0%

honor (Lord, Lady, Sir or Dame) if the painter used it in/on works or if he/she is listed with the term of honor in reference works.

The names of five painters were given primary assignment to this category and a further three names with primary assignment elsewhere were found to illustrate this problem category also. Tables 10A and 10B present a summary of findings for these eight names.

The eight names were found 33 times in the tools in 18 variant forms. The 100 fields matched only 6.1% of the time (2 out of 33) and the same was true for the 400 fields giving a total of 12.2% matches. The eight names appeared in a combined total of 37 variants forms, of which 19 (51.4%) were unique to the LC MARC records and 15 (40.5%) were unique to the bibliographic tools. Fifteen of the 18 variants found in the tools (83.3%) did not appear in the authority records. Of the 33 entries in the tools, 23 (69.7%) used the term of honor in the name heading; 7 of 8 (87.5%) of the authority records contained the term.

Sir Charles Eastlake, Sir Coutts Lindsay, Sir William Charles Ross, and Lady Laura Alma-Tadema were listed in the tools with the term of honor; however the consistent pattern was that this term preceded the given name and thus there was no chance that the authority records would match the tools. The tool entries for Lady Elizabeth Butler were more varied. Only two of five tools used the term of honor. One placed it before the given name, but both included an additional given name which was not included in either the 100 or the 400 field of the authority record. It should be noted that in all cases where the term of honor preceded the given name in a tool entry, the name still filed alphabetically as if the term were not there. In other words, "Eastlake, Sir Charles" would file after "Eastlake, Carl" and not after "Eastlake, Sinbad."

Category 11: Terms of address for married women

According to rule 22.15B, the term of address for a married woman is to be added if she is identified only by her husband's

Table 10A

Summary of findings for painters using British terms of honor

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Alma-Tadema, Laura, Lady	0	0	3	3	3	3	6
Butler, Elizabeth, Lady	0	0	5	4	2	4	6
Eastlake, Charles Locke, Sir	0	0	5	1	2	1	3
Lindsay, Coutts, Sir	0	0	4	1	2	1	3
Ross, William Charles, Sir	0	0	5	1	2	1	3
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence, Sir *	0	0	4	2	3	2	5
Forbes-Robertson, Johnston, Sir *	0	0	2	2	4	2	6
Severn, Ann Mary, Lady Newton *	2	2	5	4	1	1	5
TOTALS 8	2	2	33	18	19	15	37

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 2/33 = 6.1%
% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 2/33 = 6.1%
Total % entries matching LC = 4/33 = 12.2%

% variants in LC only = 19/37 = 51.4%
% variants only in tools = 15/37 = 40.5%
% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 15/18 = 83.3%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

Table 10B

Use of British terms of honor

		# Entries under term in tools	# Entries in tools	Term used in LC
Alma-Tadema, Laura, Lady		2	3	1
Butler, Elizabeth, Lady		2	5	1
Eastlake, Charles Locke, Sir		5	5	1
Lindsay, Coutts, Sir		4	4	1
Ross, William Charles, Sir		5	5	1
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence, Sir		2	4	1
Forbes-Robertson, Johnston, Sir		2	2	1
Severn, Ann Mary, Lady Newton		1	5	0
TOTALS	8	23	33	7

% of entries in tools using British terms of honor = 23/33 = 69.7%

% of authority records containing British terms of honor = 7/8 = 87.5%

69

70

name. Three painters were given primary assignment to this category and a further seven names with primary assignment in another problem category were found that also illustrated this problem. Tables 11A and 11B summarize the results for this category.

The 10 names were found in the tools 38 times in 28 variant forms, showing that the tools have a lack of agreement as to headings. Twelve of the 38 entries (31.6%) used the term of address for a married woman. In no case did the LC 100 field use the term of address; 5 of the 10 cases (50%) used the term of address in a 400 field. Overall, the MARC 100 fields matched the entries in the tools 16 out of 38 times (42.1%). The 400 fields matched in 6 of 38 cases (15.8%) for a total of 57.9% matches. The names appeared in a total of 52 variants of which 24 (46.2%) were unique to the authority records and 14 (26.9%) were unique to the tools. One-half (14 out of 28) of the variants found in the bibliographic tools did not appear in the authority records.

Category 12: Additions to distinguish identical names

Rule 22.17A instructs the librarian to add the birth and death dates for painters if the name is otherwise identical to that of another individual. Library of Congress also follows the option which directs the librarian to add these dates even when they aren't needed to distinguish identical names. Sections 22.18 and 22.19 provide rules for other additions; however this study includes only names to which dates have been added.

The names of two painters were assigned to this problem category, which is summarized in Tables 12A and 12B. The names were found in 9 entries in the tools, in 4 variant forms. Of the four entries for Andrew Robertson, one used his dates; thus, this entry was matched by the 100 field of the MARC record while the other three were not. William Page appeared in 5 of the tools, 2 times with dates and three times without. Again, for the 2 out of 5 times the dates were included in tools, the LC MARC 100 field matched the tool entries.

Table 11A

Summary of findings for painters using terms of address for married women

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Arendup, Edith (Mme. Arendup)	1	0	2	2	1	1	3
Bodichon, Barbara (Mme. Eugene Bodichon)	1	N/A	3	3	0	2	3
Perugini, Kate (Mrs. Charles Edward Perugini)	1	1	5	4	1	2	5
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte * (Mrs. Walter Turnbull, Mrs. Valentine Bartholomew)	4	1	5	2	5	0	7
Boyle, Eleanor Vere * (Mrs. Richard Boyle)	0	1	2	2	3	1	5
Browne, Henriette * (Mme. Jules Desaux)	1	0	4	4	2	3	6
Dewing, Maria Richards * (Mrs. Thomas W. Dewing)	0	2	4	4	4	2	8

Table 11A cont'd.)

Summary of findings for painters using terms of address for married women

	# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Edwards, Mary Ellen * (Mrs. John Staples, Mrs. John Freer)	3	0	4	2	3	1	5
Jacquemart, Nelie * (Mme. Edouard Jacquemart)	1	N/A	4	3	0	2	3
Jopling, Louise * (Mrs. J.M Jopling, Mrs. Frank Romer, Mrs. Louise Jopling-Rowe)	4	1	5	2	5	0	7
TOTALS 10	16	6	38	28	24	14	52

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 16/38 = 42.1%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 6/38 = 15.8%

Total % entries matching LC = 22/38 = 57.9%

% variants only in LC = 24/52 = 46.2%

% variants only in tools = 14/52 = 26.9%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 14/28 = 50.0%

* These painters have primary assignment in another category but have been found to illustrate this problem category as well.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 11B

Use of terms of address for married women

		# Entries use term in tools	# Entries in tools	Term used in LC 100	Term used in LC 400
Arendup, Edith		1	2	0	0
Bodichon, Barbara		1	3	0	0
Peruginin, Kate		3	5	0	1
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte		1	5	0	1
Boyle, Eleanor Vere		1	2	0	0
Browne, Henriette		1	4	0	1
Dewing, Maria Richards		1	4	0	1
Edwards, Mary Ellen		1	4	0	0
Jacquemart, Nelie		1	4	0	0
Jopling, Louise		1	5	0	1
TOTALS	10	12	38	0	5

% entries in tools using term of address for married women = 12/38 = 31.6%
% authority records containing term of address for married women = (0 + 5)/10 = 50.0%

Table 12A

Summary of findings for additions to distinguish names

		# Entries in tools matching LC 100	# Entries in tools matching LC 400	Total # entries in tools	# Var-iants in tools	# Var-iants only in LC	# Var-iants only in tools	Total # var-iants
Robertson, Andrew		1	N/A	4	2	0	1	2
Page, William		2	0	5	2	1	1	3
TOTALS	2	3	0	9	4	1	2	5

% entries in tools matching LC 100 = 3/9 = 33.3%

% entries in tools matching LC 400 = 0/9 = 0.0%

Total % entries matching LC = 3/9 = 33.3%

% variants only in LC = 1/5 = 20.0%

% variants only in tools = 2/5 = 40.0%

% variants in tools which were found *only* in tools = 2/4 = 50.0%

Table 12B

Use of dates

		# Entries using dates in tools	# Entries in tools	Dates used in LC 100
Robertson, Andrew		1	4	1
Page, William		2	5	1
TOTALS	2	3	9	2

% of entries in tools using dates = 3/9 = 33.3%

% of authority records containing dates in 100 field = 2/2 = 100%

For both painters, where the entries in the bibliographic tools did not include dates in the heading, the biographical material following the heading did include the dates.

Summary of findings

The names of fifty-seven Victorian Era painters were searched in six bibliographic tools and subsequently searched in the Library of Congress Name Authority File. Tables 13, 14A, and 14B are summary tables for all categories. Table 13 summarizes the findings for each category and places each painter in *all* categories for which the name is illustrative. Thus Table 13 is useful for looking at individual category totals; it presents a synopsis of the foregoing discussion regarding matches between the bibliographic tools and the LC Name Authority File records.

Table 14A summarizes the findings with each painter included *only* in the category to which he/she was primarily assigned; thus, there is no duplication of individual names. This table is useful *not* for looking at category totals, but for consideration of the aggregate totals of findings; it presents information on the matches between the entries in the bibliographic tools and the MARC records of the LC NAF. Table 14B, also containing no duplication, presents information on the variant forms of painters names.

The total number of variant forms found in both the LC NAF and the bibliographic tools was 267. Since the number of names searched was 57, the average number of variants per painter was 4.68 (267/57). One-hundred-forty-one (141) of these variants were found in the bibliographic tools in a total of 211 entries. Of the 267 variants found, 126 (47.2%) were unique to the LC authority file. 90 of the variants (33.7%) were unique to the bibliographic tools. 63.8% of the variants found in the tools (90 out of 141) were not exactly matched by either the 100 or the 400 fields of the authority records.

Of the 211 entries in the bibliographic tools, 68 (32.2%, or not quite one-third) matched exactly the 100 fields of the

Table 13

Summary of findings for all categories

	# painters searched	# Entries in tools	Entries in tools match LC 100	% entries match LC 100	Entries in tools match LC 400	% entries match LC 400	Total % matching entries
Category 1 (Choice of name)	11	43	19	44.2%	8	18.6%	62.8%
Category 2 (Pseudonyms)	5	16	6	37.5%	2	12.5%	50.0%
Category 3 (Change of name)	9	36	18	50.0%	7	19.4%	69.4%
Category 4 (Different forms)	8	29	10	34.5%	3	10.3%	44.8%
Category 5 (Compound surnames)	6	23	8	34.8%	4	17.4%	52.2%
Category 6 (Hyphenated surnames)	6	20	6	30.0%	5	25.0%	55.0%
Category 7 (Separate prefixes)	8	27	10	37.0%	2	7.4%	44.4%
Category 8 (Titles of nobility)	7	25	5	20.0%	2	8.0%	28.0%

Table 13 (cont'd.)

Summary of findings for all categories

	# painters searched	# Entries in tools	Entries in tools match LC 100	% entries match LC 100	Entries in tools match LC 400	% entries match LC 400	Total % matching entries
Category 9 (Initials)	2	6	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	66.7%
Category 10 (Terms of honor)	8	33	2	6.1%	2	6.1%	12.2%
Category 11 (Terms of address)	10	38	16	42.1%	6	15.8%	57.9%
Category 12 (Additions)	2	9	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	33.3%

Table 14A

Summary of matching for all categories with no duplication of names

	# painters searched	# Entries in tools	Entries in tools match LC 100	% entries match LC 100	Entries in tools match LC 400	% entries match LC 400	Total % matching entries
Category 1 (Choice of name)	9	36	16	44.4%	8	22.2%	66.6%
Category 2 (Pseudonyms)	4	12	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	50.0%
Category 3 (Change of name)	4	15	4	26.7%	2	13.3%	40.0%
Category 4 (Different forms)	6	22	10	45.5%	3	13.6%	59.1%
Category 5 (Compound surnames)	6	23	8	34.8%	4	17.4%	52.2%
Category 6 (Hyphenated surnames)	5	17	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	64.7%
Category 7 (Separate prefixes)	8	27	10	37.0%	2	7.4%	44.4%
Category 8 (Titles of nobility)	3	12	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	8.3%

Table 14A (cont'd.)

Summary of matching for all categories with no duplication of names

	# painters searched	# Entries in tools	Entries in tools match LC 100	% entries match LC 100	Entries in tools match LC 400	% entries match LC 400	Total % matching entries
Category 9 (Initials)	2	6	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	66.7%
Category 10 (Terms of honor)	5	22	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Category 11 (Terms of address)	3	10	3	30.0%	1	10.0%	40.0%
Category 12 (Additions)	2	9	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	33.3%
TOTALS	57	211	68	32.2%	28	13.3%	45.5%

Table 14 B

Summary of variants for all categories

	# Variants in tools	# Variants only in LC	# Variants only in tools	Total # Variants
Category 1	23	21	10	44
Category 2	11	10	6	21
Category 3	12	9	8	21
Category 4	16	8	11	24
Category 5	12	17	8	29
Category 6	8	14	4	22
Category 7	21	18	14	39
Category 8	11	9	10	20
Category 9	4	6	2	10
Category 10	10	11	10	21
Category 11	9	2	5	11
Category 12	4	1	2	5
TOTALS	141	126	90	267

authority records. An additional 28 (13.3%) of the entries in the tools were matched by the 400 fields of the authority records. *Thus the authority records provide exact matches to 45.5% of the variants as found in the bibliographic tools.*

The names of the 57 artists were found in 267 variants. 126 of these were found only in the authority records; *Of the 141 variants found in the tools, 90, or 63.8% did not appear in the authority records.*

The tools themselves show no great agreement, particularly in some categories. Table 15 summarizes the number of entries, number of variants, the number of variants per name and the number of entries per variant for all categories. Overall each name included in this study was found in the tools an average of 3.70 times in the tools. The average number of variants per name was 2.47 (211/57) and the average number of entries per variant was 1.5. *Each variant found in the tools appeared in the tools only 1.5 times.*

The factors contributing to the surprisingly low match rate are many and varied. As has already been seen, under the criteria for matching as set up at the beginning of this study, the inclusion/exclusion or placement of a term of honor, a term of address, or a title often negated the possibility of an exact match. This was the case even though the bibliographic tools uniformly filed the name alphabetically as though such a term were not present. Unfortunately, a study of this nature provides no information regarding how a scholar might approach the catalog after having come across such an instance in a reference tool.

Another factor which prevented many exact matches was variance in whether or not second (and subsequent) given names were included. The order in which given names were listed also prevented exact matching. Disagreement on order or extent of given names accounted for 37 (of 211) tool entries not being matched by the authority records. This is 17.5% of the total number of entries. The inclusion of a title, term of address, or

Table 15
Agreement/Disagreement in Tools

Category	# Names Searched	# Entries in Tools	# Variants in Tools	Variants per Name	Entries per Variant
Category 1 (Choice of name)	11	43	27	2.45	1.59
Category 2 (Pseudonyms)	5	16	14	2.80	1.14
Category 3 (Change of name)	9	36	24	2.67	1.50
Category 4 (Different forms)	8	29	20	2.50	1.45
Category 5 (Compound surnames)	6	23	12	2.00	1.92
Category 6 (Hyphenated surnames)	6	20	11	1.83	1.82
Category 7 (Separate prefixes)	8	27	21	2.63	1.29
Category 8 (Titles of nobility)	7	25	21	3.00	1.19
Category 9 (Initials)	2	6	4	2.00	1.50

Table 15(cont'd.)

Agreement/Disagreement in Tools

Category	# Names Searched	# Entries in Tools	# Variants in Tools	Variants per Name	Entries per Variant
Category 10 (Terms of honor)	8	33	18	2.25	1.83
Category 11 (Terms of address)	10	38	28	2.80	1.36
Category 12 (additions)	2	9	4	2.00	2.25
Aggregate Totals with no duplication	57	211	141	2.47	1.50

term of honor and/or its placement before the first listed given name accounted for 17 of the 211 tool entries not being matched; this represents 8.0% of all tool entries.

A third factor pertains to the choice of bibliographic tools. The ones chosen represent a fraction of similar tools available to fine arts scholars. A tool written entirely in the French language was included in this study, and this tool frequently contained alternate spellings. When a painter was not active in a French-speaking country, this meant that the LC NAF would not contain that variant spelling. This tool is a well-known and often-used reference work in the fine arts; in these days of international cooperation, one cannot expect that every reference tool used will be in the English language. Another tool, *The Dictionary of Victorian Painters,* routinely inserted titles, terms of honor, and terms of address preceding the first given name in headings, thus preventing exact matches.

One factor which accounts for some of the 126 variants which were unique to the LC authority records may well be that a surprising number of these artists had also published print works. Thus some variants in the authority file records were taken from title pages and were unique to the LC NAF. These same variants were present in biographical information in the tools but were not included in those name headings. For instance, Anne Charlotte Bartholomew had previously been married to Walter Turnbull, and during that marriage she published several plays. The 100 field of the authority record lists her as "Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte," (the later name) and there are six 400 fields in the record. Two of these list her surname as "Bartholomew" and the other 4 list her surname as "Turnbull." Four of the five tools in which her name appeared contained biographical information including the surname "Turnbull," and had cross-references from that name, but none used that name in a heading.

Of course, not all categories exhibited such dismal results as the whole. In particular, categories for choice of name and

change of name show match rates of over 60% (better, but still not good enough), and there was a two-thirds match rate for entry under initials. The category for compound surname shows a match rate of 52.2%, but as has already been pointed out there was an 83.3% match rate on the area of greatest interest: the entry element of the compound surname. Similarly with the category for hyphenated surnames, where the match rate is 55.0% overall, but is 100% for the entry element.

The lowest match rates were for titles of nobility, British terms of honor, and additions to distinguish names. The presence or absence of dates in a tool entry naturally affected exactness of match in this last category, but may well not contribute to frustration at the catalog.

One may consider the percentage of entries in the tools which were **not** found in the authority records (55.5%) or one may consider the percentage of variants found in the bibliographic tools which did **not** appear in the Library of Congress Authority File (33%). These figures seem to indicate that we as librarians are not serving fine arts scholars at the highest level. However, these figures do not address an issue which may be covered by keyword searches on surname in some automated systems: that of matches on entry element alone.

Table 16, which does not duplicate painters in additional problem categories, does consider the issue of entry element matching. In 6 of the 12 categories, the entries in the bibliographic tools were matched by either a MARC 100 or a MARC 400 field 100% of the time. Only one category (that for painters using pseudonyms) exhibits a match rate of less than 86%. The match rate for all 57 names searched was 92.9%. *For 92.9% of entries for names searched in this study, the entry element used in a chosen bibliographic tool was matched by either a 100 or a 400 MARC field in the LC NAF.*

Table 16

Summary of matches for entry element only

	# unique painters	# Entries in tools	# Entries match LC for entry element	% match entry element
Category 1 (Choice of name)	9	36	33	91.7%
Category 2 (Pseudonyms)	4	12	7	58.3%
Category 3 (Change of name)	4	15	13	86.7%
Category 4 (Different forms)	6	22	21	95.5%
Category 5 (Compound surnames)	6	23	20	87.0%
Category 6 (Hyphenated surnames)	5	17	17	100%
Category 7 (Separate prefixes)	8	27	27	100%
Category 8 (Titles of nobility)	3	12	12	100%
Category 9 (Initials)	2	6	5	83.3%
Category 10 (Terms of honor)	5	22	22	100%
Category 11 (Terms of address)	3	10	10	100%
Category 12 (Additions)	2	9	9	100%
TOTALS	57	211	196	92.9%

Conclusions

Responsible library and information science professionals aspire to serve their clientele as well as possible. Comparing the degree of correspondence between tools created by scholars and those created by librarians is one part of attempting to serve the clientele. This study provides a beginning look at this issue in the field of the fine arts. This initial glimpse of the situation as regards personal name formation indicates that our rules for name headings permit significant differences between catalog headings and names of artists as formed in the bibliographic tools used in this study.

The sample in this study was small compared to the total number of Victorian Era painters and was not a random one. No generalizations can be made from the set of names used here to the population of artists names. On the other hand, it was not difficult for the researcher, while having no advance knowledge of problem names, to find the names used in the study. In a few cases, the names used in a category represent a significant portion of the set of all names which would fall into the category. A good example is the category for entry under initials. Within the constraints that the name be found in the LC NAF, the two names assigned to this category represent the complete set of painters using initials whose names could be found in at least one of the six bibliographic tools used in this study.

To learn more about the problem of personal name formation of artists, a study using a large random sample of names drawn from all areas of the fine arts would be of great use. A larger selection of bibliographic tools from the area of the fine arts would enhance any such study.

In particular, the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities has recently completed its *Union List of Artists Names*. The *List* has been created, at least in part, by art librarians. Unfortunately this tool was not available to the researcher in time for the completion of this study. A comparison

using this tool would be of great benefit to understanding the problem examined here.

The disagreement between scholar-created bibliographic tools and the Library of Congress Authority File on given names, their order and extent, accounted for 17.5% of non-matched tool entries. The practice in the tools of placing titles, terms of address, and terms of honor preceding given names, yet filing those names as if the term were not present, accounted for a further 8% of non-matched entries. Even so, the overall match rate for entry elements was 92.9%.

These results give added importance to the notion that to fully examine the issue of how well we serve fine arts scholars in the area of personal name formation, we need to turn to the scholars themselves. A study involving users who are presented with name headings taken from scholar-created tools, together with biographical information, and then asked to approach the catalog would be useful. A situation where search keystrokes could be captured and follow-up questionnaires were used would more sharply delineate this problem. Indeed, in order to best serve this clientele, librarians will need to consult with fine arts scholars on a continuing basis.

Works Cited

Benezit, E. 1976. Dictionnaire critique at documentaire des peintures, sculpteurs, dessinateurs et graveurs, nouvelle edition. Paris: Librairie Grund.

Champlin, John Denison. 1927. Cyclopedia of painters and painting. New York: Empire State Book Co.

Clack, Doris Hargrett. 1990. Authority control: Principles, applications, and instructions. Chicago: American Library Association.

Dunford, Penny. 1990. A biographical dictionary of women artists in Europe and America since 1850. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Fuller, Elizabeth E. 1989. Variation in personal names in works represented in the catalog. Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 9: 75-95.

Gorman, Michael, and Paul W. Winkler, eds. 1988. Anglo-American cataloging rules. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association.

Havlice, Patricia Pate. 1973. Index to artistic biography. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Jones, Lois Swan. 1978. Art research methods and resources: A guide to finding art information. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub.Co.

Kellough, Patrick H. 1988. Name authority work and problem solving: The value of the LC name authority file. Technicalities 8: 3-5.

Miller, Julie L. 1994. Name formation of Victorian women writers: a comparison of Library of Congress authority records and bibliographic tools. Master's research paper, Kent State University. Dialog, ERIC, ED 376 851.

Pandit, Idresa. 1992. Informal communication in the humanities: A qualitative inquiry. Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois.

Pollard. Elizabeth B. 1986. Visual arts research: A handbook. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Siegfried, Susan L. and Deborah N. Wilde. 1990. Scholars go online. Art Documentation 9: 139-141.

Stone, Sue. 1982. Humanities scholars: Information needs and uses. Journal of Documentation 38: 292-313.

Taylor, Arlene G. 1992. Variations in personal name access points in OCLC bibliographic records. Library Resources & Technical Services 36: 224-241.

Thomas, Catherine M. 1984. Authority control in manual versus online catalogs: an examination of "see" references. Information Technology and Libraries 3: 393-398.

Watson, Mark R. and Arlene G. Taylor. 1987. Implications of current reference structures for authority work in online environments. Information Technology and Libraries 6: 10-19.

Weintraub, Tamara S. 1991. Personal Name Variations: Implications for authority control in computerized catalogs. Library Resources & Technical Services 35: 217-228.

Wiberley, Jr., Stephen E. 1988. Names in space and time: The indexing vocabulary of the humanities. Library Quarterly 58: 1-28.

Williamson, George C. 1903. Bryan's dictionary of painters and engravers, new edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Macmillan.

Wood, Christopher. 1978. The dictionary of Victorian painters, 2nd edition. Woodbridge, Suffolk, England: Antique Collector's Club.

APPENDIX A:
DATA COLLECTION SHEET

APPENDIX A

Problem Category _____

Name _____

LC ARN # _____

Variant forms:

1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								

Notes:

APPENDIX B:

A LIST OF PAINTERS USED IN THE STUDY

Abbreviations used for Bibliographic Tools

BDWA *A Biographical Dictionary of Women Artists in Europe and America Since 1750*, bY Penny Dunford. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.

BRY *Bryan's Dictoionary of Painters and Engravers*, by George C. Williamson. New York, Macmillan, 1903.

CPP *Cyclopedia of Painters and Painting*, by John Denison Champlin. New York, Empire State Book Co., 1927.

DDP *Dictionnaire Critique et Documentaire des Peintres, Sculpteurs, Dessinateurs et Graveurs*, by E. Benezit. Nouvelle Edition. Paris: Librairie Grund, 1976.

DVP *The Dictionary of Victorian Painters*, by Christopher Wood. 2nd edition. Woodbridge, Suffolk, England: Antique Collector's Club, 1978.

HAVL *Index to Artistic Biography*, by Patricia Pate Havlice. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Victorian Era Painters Used in the Study

Name	LC ARN #	Bibliographic Tools
Aligny, Claude d'	2852667	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Alma-Tadema, Laura	3637157	CPP, DDP, DVP
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence	293155	CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Ansingh, Lizzy	2708488	BDWA, DDP
Arendup, Edith	3635752	BDWA, DVP
Armand-Dumaresq, Charles	2743551	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte	772555	BDWA, BRY, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Bastien-Lepage, Jules	1405205	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Beers, Jan van	3809490	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, Anna	3643511	BDWA, DDP
Bisschop-Robertson	1264986	BDWA, DDP
Blunden, Anna	3639955	BDWA, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Bodichon, Barbara	1307732	BDWA, DVP, HAVL
Bonheur, Juliette	3639957	BDWA, BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Bonheur, Rosa	452112	BDWA, BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Boyle, Eleanor	970006	DVP, HAVL
Brickdale, Eleanor	93546	BDWA, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Browne, Henriette	3822418	BDWA, BRY, DDP, HAVL
Butler, Elizabeth	2554305	BDWA, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Canon, Hans	3660430	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Carolus-Duran	2379765	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Czermak, Jaroslav	684480	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Dewing, Maria Richards	1780775	BDWA, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Eastlake, Charles Lock	59822	BRY, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Edwards, Mary Ellen	2797824	BDWA, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Engerth, Eduard von	3981558	CPP, DPP
Forbes, Robertson, Johnston	868621	DDP, DVP
Fortuny Y Carbo	61462	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Harrach, Ferdinand	3966508	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Jacquemart, Nelie	3664746	BDWA, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Jopling, Louise	880653	BDWA, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL

Victorian Era Painters Used in the Study

Name	LC ARN #	Bibliographic Tools
Kaulbach, Wilhelm von	1095290	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Lindsay, Coutts		CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Leighton of Stretton, Frederic Leighton	460814	BRY, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Lafaye, Prosper	3247653	CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Leys, Hendrik	3357988	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Louise Caroline Alberta, Princess	2402500	BDWA, HAVL
Madrazo Y Agudo	1234421	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Marcello	546113	BDWA, DDP, HAVL
Marval, Jacqueline	2823908	BDWA, DDP
Morel-Fatio, Antoine Leon	2521929	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Munkacsy, Mihaly	67340	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Nanteuil, Celestin Leboeuf	1450467	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Page, William	1666595	BRY, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Perugini, Kate	3779954	BDWA, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Pettenkofen, August von	2988964	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Piloty, Karl von	1382782	BRY, CPP, DDP
Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre	84387	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Ramberg, Arthur Georg von	2763095	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Robertson, Andrew	915166	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Ross, William Charles	3297633	BRY, CPP, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Schnorr von Karolsfeld, Julius	1453815	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Schwind, Moritz von	1174629	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL
Severn, Ann Mary	3491370	BDWA, BRY, DDP, DVP, HAVL
Smedley, W.T.	698906	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan	1095905	CPP, DDP, HAVL
Turpin de Crisse, Lancelot	3472000	BRY, CPP, DDP, HAVL

APPENDIX C:

A LIST OF PROBLEM CATEGORIES USED IN THE STUDY

Problem Categories Used in the Study

Category 1	Choice of name
Category 2	Pseudonyms
Category 3	Change of name
Category 4	Different forms of the same name
Category 5	Compound surnames
Category 6	Hyphenated surnames
Category 7	Separately written prefixes
Category 8	Titles of nobility
Category 9	Entry under initials
Category 10	British terms of honor
Category 11	Terms of address for married women
Category 12	Additions to distinguish names

Victorian Era Painters Used in the Study

Name	Primary Problem Category	Other Problem Categories
Aligny, Claude d'	7	
Alma-Tadema, Laura	10	6
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence	6	4, 10
Ansingh, Lizzy	4	
Arendup, Edith	11	
Armand-Dumaresq, Charles	6	
Bartholomew, Anne Charlotte	1	3, 11
Bastien-Lepage, Jules	6	
Beers, Jan van	7	
Bilinska-Bohdanowicz, Anna	1	3
Bisschop,Suze	3	
Blunden, Anna	3	
Bodichon, Barbara	11	
Bonheur, Juliette	3	
Bonheur, Rosa	4	
Boyle, Eleanor	9	11
Brickdale, Eleanor	1	
Browne, Henriette	2	11
Butler, Elizabeth	10	
Canon, Hans	1	
Carolus-Duran	2	
Czermak, Jaroslav	4	
Dewing, Maria Richards	3	11
Eastlake, Charles Lock	10	
Edwards, Mary Ellen	9	1, 3, 11
Engerth, Eduard von	7	
Forbes-Robertson, Johnston	6	10
Fortuny Y Carbo	5	
Harrach, Ferdinand	8	
Jacquemart, Nelie	1	11
Jopling, Louise	1	3, 11

Victorian Era Painters Used in the Study

Name	Primary Problem Category	Other Problem Categories
Kaulbach, Wilhelm von	7	
Lafaye, Prosper	4	
Leighton of Stretton, Frederic Leighton	8	
Leys, Hendrik	8	
Lindsay, Coutts	10	
Louise Caroline Alberta, Princess	1	8
Madrazo Y Agudo	5	
Marcello	2	8
Marval, Jacqueline	2	
Morel-Fatio, Antoine Leon	6	
Munkacsy, Mihaly	4	2
Nanteuil, Celestin Leboeuf	1	
Page, William	12	
Perugini, Kate		
Pettenkofen, August von	7	
Piloty, Karl von	7	
Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre	5	
Ramberg, Arthur Georg von	7	8
Robertson, Andrew	12	
Ross, William Charles	10	
Schnorr von Karolsfeld, Julius	5	
Schwind, Moritz von	7	
Severn, Ann Mary	1	3, 10
Smedley, W.T.	4	
Szekely de Adamas, Bertalan	5	1, 4
Turpin de Crisse, Lancelot	5	8